



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,827	12/19/2001	Hiroshi Tojo	03500.000002.	8451
5514 7590 10/02/2008 FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				
EXAMINER				
PESIN, BORIS M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/02/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/033,827

Applicant(s)

TOJO ET AL.

Examiner

BORIS PESIN

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 7/9/2008.

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 16, 25, 30 and 31 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 7/9/2008, claims 1, 11, 16, 25, 30 and 31 were amended. This action is made Non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification, as originally filed, does not describe the added limitation "has no inclusion relationship with the other scenes so that the plurality of scenes do not construct a tree structure." Since the Examiner can not find support for the added limitation, no art rejection will be made with respect to the added limitations. However, the Examiner is making this action non-final so that the Applicant can specifically point out in the next response how the specification supports the added limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-26, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi et al. (US 5956453) in view of Hong et al. (US 5532833).

In regards to claim 1, Yaegashi teaches an image processing apparatus comprising: a storage device that stores scene information including, at least, data for at least one representative frame extracted from, data for an interval of the scene and data for a significance level of the scene of each of a plurality of scenes included in a moving picture to be played back (Figure 6B, Element 201, the significance level is the different hierarchy levels); a selection device that receives a selection of one of the concurrently displayed images of the representative frames on the basis of an external designation

(Column 4, Lines 12-31); and a playback device that plays back the scenes corresponding to the images of the representative frames selected by the selection device (Column 4, Lines 12-31).

Yaegashi does not specifically teach that each of the plurality of scenes is mutually disjoint and that a display device that extracts, on the basis of the externally designated significance level, images of the representative frames of the plurality of scenes having significance levels equals to or higher than the externally designated significance level, from the storage device and concurrently displays the extracted images chronologically. Hong teaches that each of the plurality of scenes is mutually disjoint (See Column 6, Lines 10-27, there is a list of the different scenes with each one having a representative frame) and that a display device that extracts, on the basis of the externally designated significance level, images of the representative frames of the plurality of scenes having significance levels equals to or higher than the externally designated significance level (See Column 7, Lines 26-45, the user is able to select the retrieval conditions, specifically the user is able to select attributes (i.e. significance level) and those frames with those attributes (thus equal) will be displayed), from the storage device and concurrently displays the extracted images chronologically (See figure 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yaegashi with the teachings of Hong and include a search functionality with the motivation to provide the user an easier way of finding desired scenes.

In regards to claim 2, Yaegashi-Hong further teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the display device chronologically displays a specified number of the images of the representative frames of the plurality of scenes concurrently (Yaegashi Figure 6B, Element 201).

In regards to claim 3, Yaegashi-Hong further teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the display device refers to the scene information in the storage device when a significance level is externally designated (Hong Column 5, Lines 26-45), and chronologically displays images of the representative frames of the scenes having significance levels equal to or higher than the externally designated significances level (Hong Figure 12).

In regards to claim 5, Yaegashi-Hong teaches an image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the display device displays the images of the representative frames with data indicative of the significance level corresponding to the representative frames being added to the images of the representative frames (Yaegashi Figure 6B, the hierarchy level, also see Column 3, Lines 52-67).

In regards to claim 6, Yaegashi-Hong teaches an image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the display device displays the scene played back by the playback device together with the images of the representative frames of the scenes, and displays data for discriminating representative frames corresponding to the scene being currently played back from the other representative frames (Yaegashi Figure 1, Element 202 and Hong Figures 12 and 13).

In regards to claim 7, Yaegashi-Hong teaches an image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the display device changes a display condition in the images of the representative frames of the scenes that are chronologically displayed based on an external instruction (Hong Figure 11, the user is able to indicate the retrieve condition).

In regards to claim 8, Yaegashi-Hong teaches an image processing apparatus according to claim 6, wherein the display device changes a display condition in the images of the representative frames of the scenes that are chronologically displayed, synchronizing with the images being played back by the playback device (Yaegashi Abstract, and Figure 1 Element 201 and Hong Figure 13).

In regards to claim 9, Yaegashi-Hong teaches an image processing apparatus according to claim 6, wherein the display device changes a display condition and selects whether change of the display condition is synchronized with the images being played back by the playback device, based on an external instruction (Yaegashi Abstract and Hong Figures 11-13, the retrieve command).

In regards to claim 10, Yaegashi-Hong teaches an image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the playback device plays back one of the scenes corresponding to one of the images of the representative frames of the scenes, which is externally designated among the images of the representative frames of the scenes displayed by the display device (Yaegashi Abstract and Figure 6B, Hong Figure 13 Element 96).

In regards to claim 11, Yaegashi teaches an image processing apparatus comprising: a storage device that stores scene information including, at least, data for at least one representative frame extracted from a scene (Abstract) and data for a significance level of the scene of each of a plurality of scenes included in a moving picture to be played back (Abstract, the hierarchy is the significance level); and a selection device that receives a selection of one of the concurrently displayed representative frames one the basis of an external designation (Column 4, Lines 12-31).

Yaegashi does not specifically teach that each of the plurality of scenes is mutually disjoint and that a display device that extracts, one the basis of the externally designated significance level, images of the representative frames of the plurality of scenes having significance levels greater than or equal to the externally designated significance level, from the storage device and concurrently displays the extracted images chronologically. Hong teaches hat each of the plurality of scenes is mutually disjoint (See Column 6, Lines 10-27, there is a list of the different scenes with each one having a representative frame) and that a display device that extracts, one the basis of the externally designated significance level, images of the representative frames of the plurality of scenes having significance levels grater then or equal to than the externally designated significance level (See Column 7, Lines 26-45, the user is able to select the retrieval conditions, specifically the user is able to select attributes (i.e. significance level) and those frames with those attributes will be displayed), from the storage device and concurrently displays the extracted images chronologically (See figure 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Yaegashi with the teachings of Hong and include a search functionality with the motivation to provide the user an easier way of finding desired scenes.

Claim 12 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is in the same context as claim 5; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 16, Yaegashi-Hong teaches an image processing method comprising: storing, in a storage device, scene information including, at least, data for at least one representative frame extracted from a scene, data for an interval of the scene and data for a significance level of each of a plurality of scenes included in a moving picture to be played back (Abstract and Figure 6B, Element 201); receiving an external designation of a significance level (Column 4, Lines 12-31 and Figure 6B, the significance level is the hierarchy level); receiving a selection of one of the concurrently-displayed images of the representative frames on the basis of an external designation (Column 4, Lines 12-31); and playing back the scenes corresponding to the images of the representative frames selected in the selecting step (Abstract, and Figure 1 Element 201).

Yaegashi does not specifically teach that each of the plurality of scenes is mutually disjoint and that a display device that extracts, one the basis of the externally designated significance level, images of the representative frames of the plurality of

scenes having significance levels equals to or higher than the externally designated significance level, from the storage device and concurrently displays the extracted images chronologically. Hong teaches that each of the plurality of scenes is mutually disjoint (See Column 6, Lines 10-27, there is a list of the different scenes with each one having a representative frame) and that a display device that extracts, on the basis of the externally designated significance level, images of the representative frames of the plurality of scenes having significance levels equals to or higher than the externally designated significance level (See Column 7, Lines 26-45, the user is able to select the retrieval conditions, specifically the user is able to select attributes (i.e. significance level) and those frames with those attributes will be displayed), from the storage device and concurrently displays the extracted images chronologically (See figure 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yaegashi with the teachings of Hong and include a search functionality with the motivation to provide the user an easier way of finding desired scenes.

In regards to claim 17, Yaegashi-Hong further teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 16, wherein the display step chronologically displays a specified number of the images of the representative frames of the plurality of scenes concurrently (Yaegashi Abstract and Figure 6B, Element 201).

Claim 19 is in the same context as claim 5; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is in the same context as claim 6; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is in the same context as claim 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is in the same context as claim 10; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is in the same context as claim 11; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is in the same context as claim 12; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 is in the same context as claim 14; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 29 is in the same context as claim 15; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 30 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 31 is in the same context as claim 11; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 4, 13, 18, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi-Hong in view of Acharya et al. (US 6348929).

In regards to claim 4, Yaegashi-Hong teach all the limitations of claim 1. Yaegashi does not teach an image processing apparatus wherein the images of the representative frames included reduced images. Acharya teaches, "Essentially, captured images are compressed by an image compression circuit 732 so that they can be efficiently stored in an image memory unit 734, which may be a ROM, RAM or other storage device such as a fixed disk." Column 13, Line 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yaegashi with the teachings of Acharya and include a method to compress the images with the motivation to provide the user with more space on the memory.

Claim 13 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 27 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/9/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant has not demonstrated that the added limitation to the independent claims was described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BORIS PESIN whose telephone number is (571)272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/033,827
Art Unit: 2174

Page 13

/Boris Pesin/
Examiner, Art Unit 2174